

try needs the judgment and conscience of its citizens; the conscience cannot act until the mind is informed and nothing would contribute more to the general information of the masses than the official publication of such a paper as has been described. The democratic party cannot compete with the republican party in the raising of campaign funds and in the circulating of campaign literature, and democratic leaders have, therefore, more reason than the republican leaders have to favor the inauguration of some plan for the enlightenment of the voters. Then, too, information coming through such a medium would have more influence than that which comes from a partisan source and the reader would be more open to conviction than he is in the midst of a campaign.

If free text books are furnished to children because the republic requires an intelligent citizenship, certainly the government can afford for the same reason to furnish to adults at cost the necessary information in regard to public affairs; if voluminous department reports can be furnished free to a few, certainly the people as a whole should be able to secure a correct report of official proceedings if they are willing to pay for it. The proposed plan would involve no expense to the government and the demand for the paper would determine the number of copies to be printed. It is to be hoped that some democratic member or senator will bring this matter to the attention of congress.

### Premeditated Vagueness.

The Chicago Tribune, a republican paper, in an issue of recent date, editorially described the ship subsidy bill in this way:

Manifestly the bill is drawn vaguely, but not carelessly. The vagueness is premeditated. It is part of the game. The authors and promoters of the bill wish to puncture the treasury and keep the hole wide open. They do not wish anybody to "stand by" with a plug or stopper for the leaks they propose to make and maintain for an indefinite period.

The Tribune disrespectfully submits that the subsidy bill is a high price to pay for the support of the Pennsylvania railroad in national campaigns in states where it is not needed. The republican party can, unaided, carry Pennsylvania if it can carry any state. When it cannot honestly carry Ohio, it cannot carry the country, and does not deserve to carry it.

The effrontery of the subsidy proceedings is the amazing and discouraging feature of it. When any considerable number of republican senators become so case-hardened that they can introduce and insist upon the passage of a measure of this character they are evidently preparing the way for a serious public rebuke of their party. That party, when the money question is out of the way, does not stand before the country in an unassailable position. Its alliances with the money power in the east have given rise to much popular discontent in the west. When a partnership of this kind is avowed, and is proclaimed to the whole country as being a recognized compact, it is an invitation to a popular uprising which cannot be overlooked. Such an invitation will be swiftly followed by an acceptance in quarters where it is least looked for or desired.

What does the Tribune mean when, referring to the republican party, it says, "Its alliances with the money power in the east have given rise to much popular discontent in the west?"

What does the Tribune mean when it says, "When a partnership of this kind (with the money power) is avowed, and is proclaimed to the whole country as being a recognized compact, it is an invitation to a popular uprising which cannot be overlooked?"

And what does the Tribune mean when it says, "Such an invitation will be swiftly followed by an acceptance in quarters where it is least looked for or desired?"

Has not the Tribune told us all along that there is no such thing as a money power? And has it not assured us that the forces which some people have referred to as the money power repre-

sented the "business interests" of the country?

Does the Tribune mean to incite discontent among the masses and disrespect for "business interests?"

We cannot forget that at the time the Porto Rico bill was passed, the Tribune denounced the measure in unqualified terms and within a few weeks thereafter the Tribune was brought to an ardent support of the same measure which it had vigorously denounced.

Will history repeat itself? At the first sign of a popular uprising against this partnership will the Tribune be found defending the subsidy bill with all the vigor it now employs in condemning it? Or are we to understand that this "invitation" to a "popular uprising will be swiftly followed by an acceptance in quarters where it is least looked for or desired"—even in the editorial sanctum of the Chicago Tribune?

### Twixt Satan and the Sea.

The Chicago Tribune pleads with the republicans in the house not to postpone action on the ship subsidy bill. The Tribune admits that if the house should pass the bill the republican spell-binders would have to do much explaining next fall, but it adds: "They will not be much better off if the house should postpone action, for it would be difficult for them to justify the passage of this bill in the senate or to dispel the popular apprehension that the house has put off action on the bill intending to pass it later. Awkward questions will be asked of these spell-binders as to what are the real intentions of the majority, and why it is that this bill is left suspended between heaven and earth."

And the Tribune makes this pathetic plea:

The course of honesty is the course of expediency also. There should be no dodging or equivocating. The bill should be taken up and disposed of now. If it is the policy of the republican party to enter on a general ship subsidy scheme it should have the courage of its convictions and take the consequences. If that is not to be the policy of the party, then the party should have the credit of it and should not permit itself to appear in a dubious attitude before the public.

It is not at all likely that the republicans in the house will take the Tribune's advice. It is more probable that they will postpone action and depend upon the ability of their organs and their orators to make the people believe prior to election day that the subsidy bill has no chance of passing the house; and after election day it will be the same old story of misplaced confidence.

The republican party has had such wonderful luck in fooling a large number of the people all of the time that it is not the least surprising that republican leaders count confidentially upon their ability to win new successes on this line.

### The Inevitable Result.

Judge Taft, the present head of our carpetbag government in the Philippines, is reported as saying that he is opposed to the reconcentrado policy which General Bell is said to have established in some parts of the Philippines. It is creditable to Mr. Taft that he does not approve of the cruel system introduced by Weyler and now being attempted in South Africa as well as in the Philippines, but the system is the inevitable result of an imperial policy. A government resting upon force, administered arbitrarily and defended by hypocrisy, is not apt to shrink from any measure which is calculated, or thought to be calculated, to restore order. We may at this time shudder to think that women and children are to be starved in order to compel husbands and fathers to lay down their arms, but by the time we have thoroughly accepted imperialism we will be prepared to look with equanimity upon atrocities which now shock us.

When we conclude that Destiny requires the killing of those who love liberty more than they

do life, it will be an easy step to the position occupied by those who lay the blame for starvation of women and children upon the warriors who could end the reconcentrado policy by being good subjects.

The Detroit News-Tribune published an article by Lieut. Jos. L. Kraemer of the 38th U. S. volunteer infantry. In the course of the article the lieutenant sneers at the "kid glove style of warfare" that has prevailed in the Philippines, and is gratified by the report that the Filipinos "are to be given a taste of real war." He thus describes the devastation of the country:

We set fire to all the houses and barracks and destroyed the corn, tobacco and other crops. From that height we had a splendid view of the surrounding country, and we could trace the advance of our troops by the burning houses and villages, even if we could not see the men. The villages were strung along the road as thickly as you will see them in Europe, about a quarter or half a mile apart. Everything would be still and quiet, when suddenly we would see a flame burst from the nearest house. Then the next one would be seen to be on fire, and so it spread until every house in the village was blazing. Occasionally we would hear firing, and we knew our men were killing the water buffalo, the only draught animals the Filipinos have.

He even admits that the soldiers were touched by the sight of the suffering, saying:

It was a pitiful sight when they began to come in. They came in droves, each woman carrying her food and what belongings she had been able to take with her, in a bundle, and many of them were carrying babies as well. They had been obliged to leave their water buffaloes behind them when they left their homes, and as these animals are their sole means of transport, they had to travel on foot. And now the buffaloes had been slaughtered by thousands and were scattered all over the country. The women traveled all day and reached our lines by nightfall, hungry, weary and footsore. I never saw soldiers so touched as our men were when they saw this pitiful procession coming in.

If the republicans who are supporting the administration's policy will employ a few Sunday afternoons in calculation they may be able to form some estimate as to the length of time it will take us to cultivate an affectionate feeling among the Filipinos and make them realize the advantages of our Christian civilization. And yet, revolting as are the details of the war now being carried on, imperialism is so heartless a policy that it will, if still pursued, ultimately involve our nation in transactions from which the most hardened imperialist would at this time shrink.

### Using the Sub-Treasury.

It is announced that the bankers have arranged with the treasury department to deposit some twenty millions at New York and draw it out at San Francisco. The dispatch does not say whether they are to pay any exchange, but it is to be assumed that they will. Under the present postal order system it is possible to deposit one dollar (or other sums) at the postoffice in New York and draw it out at San Francisco or any other place. Why not extend it to big transactions? If the government had a sub-treasury at every state capital it could keep its money so distributed that there would be but little necessity for the daily transfer of money by rail. The government could thus sell exchange for a much less sum than a bank possibly could. By all means let the banks try the experiment and the government may find it a profitable addition to the regular work of the money order department, but of course the privileges extended to the banks must be extended to all.

The St. Louis single tax league and a number of other political societies and labor organizations have passed resolutions appreciative of Mr. Altgeld's services. His speeches on public questions have left a permanent impression upon the thought of the country.